

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of serge@tux.org  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 12:03 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/27/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Serge Wroclawski  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> serge@tux.org  
<ADDRESS1> 2000 South Eads Street; Apt 410  
<CITY> Arlington  
<STATE> VA  
<ZIP> 22202  
<PHONE> 703-920-3514  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> I am writing to ask that the "Broadcast Flag" not be implemented as a required technology.

I believe that the current rights of the public will be diminished and taking this action will stifle innovation in devices that are able to receive television signals, such as televisions, digital video recorders and computers.

While I can understand the concerns of broadcasters, I would ask that compliance to the Broadcast Flag be industry enforced, rather than by legal mandate.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of dwchatha@naz.edu  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 12:02 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/27/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> David Chatham  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> dwchatha@naz.edu  
<ADDRESS1> 18 Birling Gap  
<CITY> Fairport  
<STATE> NY  
<ZIP> 14450  
<PHONE> 389-2121  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> Please preserve the right of our public to make full use of broadcast digital content viewed on television in their own homes. Oppose the broadcast flag.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of fling@indiana.edu  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 12:02 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/27/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Michael Fling  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> fling@indiana.edu  
<ADDRESS1> 1201 E. Third  
<CITY> Bloomington  
<STATE> IN  
<ZIP> 47405  
<PHONE>  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> The broadcast flag will limit the capability that consumers have LEGALLY enjoyed in using their computers and broadcast receivers. It also will stifle creativity. Stop it.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of bob@metheating.com  
**Sent:** Monday, October 27, 2003 11:31 AM  
**To:** outreach@nyfairuse.org  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/27/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Robert  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> bob@metheating.com  
<ADDRESS1> 820 Coney Island Avenue  
<CITY> Brooklyn  
<STATE> NY  
<ZIP> 11218  
<PHONE> 718-941-7600  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> The "broadcast flag", that the studios claim will only prevent piracy of high definition television programs over the Internet, will unfairly compromise the fair and free use of today's equipment.

In a recent Senate hearing, Motion Picture Association of America President Jack Valenti admitted that the broadcast flag "...may prevent you from taking a television show that you recorded in your living room to your bedroom or to a friend's house...."

The "broadcast flag" would undue the creativity, portability, flexibility, and an "open architecture" that allows anyone to create new products that consumers can use to view, modify and create content in exciting ways and which has promoted innovation.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of R\_C\_Patterson@hotmail.com  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 12:01 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/27/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Rory Patterson  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> R\_C\_Patterson@hotmail.com  
<ADDRESS1> 2062 Kylemore Dr.  
<CITY> Xenia  
<STATE> OH  
<ZIP> 45385  
<PHONE>  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> Please do not enact broadcast flags. My experience with video for distance education, which is must less quality that HD or EDTV, has been that the quality is not very good, and the delivery takes a long time, even on T1 lines. I see no way that HDTV broadcasts could be sent by DSL or Cable modem in a usable fashion. Please do not enact broadcast flags.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of emily.jackson.sanborn@duke.edu  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 12:01 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/27/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Emily C. Jackson Sanborn  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> emily.jackson.sanborn@duke.edu  
<ADDRESS1> 18 Braddock Circle  
<CITY> Durham  
<STATE> NC  
<ZIP> 27713  
<PHONE>  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> I am against the decision to require digital televisions to work with 'broadcast flags'. You're allowing big business to once again steamroll the rights of the individual. Sincerely, Emily Jackson Sanborn

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of eleach@cce.umn.edu  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 12:01 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/27/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Elizabeth Leach  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> eleach@cce.umn.edu  
<ADDRESS1> 1672 W. Minnehaha Ave.  
<CITY> St. Paul  
<STATE> MN  
<ZIP> 55104  
<PHONE>  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> Do not support the broadcast industry's push for the "broadcast flag." It is through the media, and increasingly through the broadcast media that citizens are able to acquire the information needed to maintain our democracy. Any assault on the ability of citizens to access media freely must be opposed.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of info@anselinc.com  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 12:00 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/27/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Joe Ansel  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> info@anselinc.com  
<ADDRESS1> 111 Park Place  
<CITY> Point Richmond  
<STATE> CA  
<ZIP> 94801  
<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*

<TEXT> As a businessman--with numerous registered copyrights--and as a consumer, I believe "A broadcast flag mandate is an ineffective solution to a non-existent problem." I oppose any such technology, because:

"...any broadcast flag mandate will impose genuine and substantial costs on consumers and innovators. It would raise the cost of DTV devices while reducing the value that they represent to consumers. It would stifle innovation in DTV and general-purpose technologies. It would abridge the First Amendment freedoms of software authors. All of this, in the end, will impede, rather than encourage, the transition to DTV." (Quotes are from the Electronic Freedom Foundation of which I am a contributing member)

Basically the movie industry wants to inconvenience the whole world so that it can prevent a bit of potential piracy, when in fact, the amount of data involved in video storage and transmission pretty much makes network based video piracy impossible.

Thank you.

Regards,

Joe Ansel



## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of gregoryshughes@juno.com  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 11:50 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/27/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Gregory S. Hughes  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> gregoryshughes@juno.com  
<ADDRESS1> 18322 72nd Ave W  
<CITY> Edmonds  
<STATE> WA  
<ZIP> 98026  
<PHONE> (425) 771-4911  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> Dear Sirs:

I wish to vehemently object to the current "Broadcast Flag" rule which the FCC is considering. It's adoption would signal that the current FCC board has abandoned it's mandated role of protecting the public airways to pander to special interests who wish to use public property for private gain.

It sends a clear message that the current FCC leadership has arrogantly overstepped it's bounds by dictating copyright issues in a non-public forum and is only interested in selling out to corporate high bidders.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of mpellingson@mindspring.com  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 11:50 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/27/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Margaret W. Ellingson

<CONTACT-EMAIL> mpellingson@mindspring.com

<ADDRESS1> 4851 Summit Hills Way

<CITY> Tucker

<STATE> GA

<ZIP> 30084

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*

<TEXT> The last thing our society needs is more regulation based on the special interests of Hollywood! The FCC and courts have already held that many of the activities which would be prohibited by implementation of a "broadcast flag" are fair uses of broadcast content in the analog world. Despite the loud voices of Jack Valenti & friends, it has yet to be demonstrated that dramatically different rules should apply to content merely because it is being delivered digitally. As proposed, the "broadcast flag" cannot distinguish between a legitimate or fair use of the content and an illegitimate use. Why should the American public lose its right of fair use entirely because some people might want to do something illegal? Copyright law & associated federal regulations are supposed to balance the interests of content creators/owners and users in order "to promote the progress of science and [the] useful arts. I don't expect Jack Valenti or others in Hollywood to concern themselves much with this balance (although they also benefit from it). However, I DO expect the FCC to do so. The rights and interests of the American public should weigh much heavier in the balance than the special interests of Hollywood.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of gregoryshughes@juno.com  
**Sent:** Monday, October 27, 2003 2:05 PM  
**To:** outreach@nyfairuse.org  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/27/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Gregory S. Hughes  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> gregoryshughes@juno.com  
<ADDRESS1> 18322 72nd Ave W  
<CITY> Edmonds  
<STATE> WA  
<ZIP> 98026  
<PHONE> (425) 771-4911  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> Dear Sirs:

I wish to vehemently object to the current "Broadcast Flag" rule which the FCC is considering. It's adoption would signal that the current FCC board has abandoned it's mandated role of protecting the public airways to pander to special interests who wish to use public property for private gain.

It sends a clear message that the current FCC leadership has arrogantly overstepped it's bounds by dictating copyright issues in a non-public forum and is only interested in selling out to corporate high bidders.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of kjn3@duke.edu  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 11:50 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/27/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Kevin Neveloff

<CONTACT-EMAIL> kjn3@duke.edu

<ADDRESS1> 134 Alder Drive

<CITY> Briarcliff Manor

<STATE> NY

<ZIP> 10510

<PHONE> 914-762-0659

<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*

<TEXT> I am writing this to urge you not to adopt the use of broadcast flags. The whole notion is unfair to consumers and will end up having the consumers turn on the FCC in the same manner in which they have turned against the RIAA. Obligating consumers to replace their DVD players, which they might have bought less than a year ago, so that they may be able to watch recordings with flags is deplorable. I wish that the entertainment industry and the governing body would take the consumer into account when making decisions instead of simply looking at the bottom line. In any case, ultimately your attempts would be a waste of time and money because if your engineers can figure out a way to put the flags in, there are many more people connected to the internet who could take them out again, rendering all the expenses for research and development and infrastructure changes all for naught. Please, I beg you, look at the situation with an unbiased perspective, a logical and even headed perspective and you will see that broadcast flags are not a good idea at all.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** eff@snark.cx  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 10:51 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/31/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Daniel Haun  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> eff@snark.cx  
<ADDRESS1> 3824 N Country Dr  
<CITY> Antelope  
<STATE> CA  
<ZIP> 95843  
<PHONE> 916-334-4963  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> Please do not let Hollywood and the MPAA control what technology I can use in my own home. Existing copyright law already protects their interests. Requiring the broadcast flag would be like outlawing VCRs, tape players, and Xerox copy machines, all devices that can be used to violate copyright but have greater non-infringing uses.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of Weber11490@hotmail.com  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 10:50 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/28/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Janet Weber  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> Weber11490@hotmail.com  
<ADDRESS1> 6565 Frantz Road  
<CITY> Dublin  
<STATE> OH  
<ZIP> 43017  
<PHONE>  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> Do not allow the movie industry to take away my rights to use my TV, Video Recorder, or computer! I oppose the "Broadcast Flag" proposal (Proposed Rulemaking #02-230).

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of lost-emperor@rcn.com  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 10:50 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/27/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Christopher S. Johnson  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> lost-emperor@rcn.com  
<ADDRESS1> 60 Thorndike St.  
<CITY> Arlington  
<STATE> MA  
<ZIP> 02474  
<PHONE> 781-646-9499  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> The population of the US is almost 300 million. Every single citizen is a potential content producer. Every single citizen is a potential technology developer. Yet this proposed rule seems to be tailored to take away key rights, property and freedoms of these millions simply to prop up the faulty business model of a few inordinately influential companies. If these companies need to stifle innovation, competition, and free expression in order to stay in business, then there can be no place for them in our republic. If these companies cannot turn a profit without telling me what I am allowed to do privately with the technology I own and create, then they are at odds with the interests of every individual citizen of our nation. If these companies have a business need to interfere with my ability to work with others towards the creation and refinement of technologies, ideas and expressions, then they are at odds with our communities. The proposed broadcast flag is a slap ! in the face to anyone who has the [audacity] to be more than a mere consumer. It is an insult.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of bjennin1@san.rr.com  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 10:49 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/28/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Blair Jennings  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> bjennin1@san.rr.com  
<ADDRESS1> 12828 Gambusa Way  
<CITY> San Diego  
<STATE> CA  
<ZIP> 92129  
<PHONE>  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> I am a member of the computer industry and the "broadcast flag" is a horrible idea it will stifle the industry and new innovations.



## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of heslinl@dowling.edu  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 10:49 AM  
**To:** KAQuirin  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/28/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> linda heslin  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> heslinl@dowling.edu  
<ADDRESS1> dowling college, idlehour Ave  
<CITY> Oakdale  
<STATE> ny  
<ZIP> 11769  
<PHONE> 631-244-3282  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> As a librarian and public citizen, I am deeply concerned and in opposition about the broadcast flag proposal.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of melillom@dowling.edu  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 10:49 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/28/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Mark W. Melillo  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> melillom@dowling.edu  
<ADDRESS1> 115 Muirfield Rd.  
<CITY> Rockville Centre  
<STATE> NY  
<ZIP> 11570  
<PHONE>  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*

<TEXT> Dear Commissioner(s):

Please note my objection to FCC NPRM 02-230, the b"broadcast flag.b" I believe that the implementation of this technology opens the door to severely limiting b"fair useb" of broadcast material in the not-too-distant future. While I understand and support an artistb"s right to maintain copyright to a work and to receive appropriate compensation, I do not believe that right should extend to limited representations of that work in an educational, not-for-profit context. I therefore urge you not to allow the use of b"broadcast flagb" technology.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of dg@BayAreaResearch.org  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 10:48 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/29/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> David Greene

<CONTACT-EMAIL> dg@BayAreaResearch.org

<ADDRESS1> 3144 David Avenue

<CITY> Palo Alto

<STATE> CA

<ZIP> 94303

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*

<TEXT> I strongly urge you to protect citizens' rights against the pressure from the movie industry to turn TV watching into a pay-per-view world. This decision is a critical one in the history of American freedom. However the issue may be spun by copyright holders, it is not necessary to turn all video hardware into monitoring devices to protect their interests. They characterize their audience as potential thieves; when all we want to do is some time-shifting and personal convenience copying. Please do not allow a wholesale shift in power that would result from using the Broadcast Flag.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of jhuggins@kettering.edu  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 10:48 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/29/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> James K. Huggins  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> jhuggins@kettering.edu  
<ADDRESS1> 14146 N. Fenton Road  
<CITY> Fenton  
<STATE> MI  
<ZIP> 48430  
<PHONE> 8107149174  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> I am concerned about the use of digital broadcast flags. It appears to me that such flags would unduly restrict the fair use rights of end users in ways that are commonly accepted today.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of jdownward@earthlink.net  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 10:48 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/29/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> James G. Downward IV  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> jdownward@earthlink.net  
<ADDRESS1> 2740 Lowell Road  
<CITY> Ann Arbor  
<STATE> MI  
<ZIP> 48103-2246  
<PHONE> (734) 995-9338  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*

<TEXT> I am writing to oppose the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking #02-230. Requiring a broadcast flag to prevent recording of digital TV broadcasts would be a bad idea and would prevent citizens from exercising fair use rights to record and view a public broadcast at a more convenient time. While modern technology does open avenues for pirating copyrighted works, the proposed rule is far too draconian. By and large, most current use of home recording technology is for personal use and falls within fair use guidelines. While video piracy exists, it does not appear that the motion picture industry is being seriously impacted. People go to movies in record numbers, videos and DVDs sell like hotcakes, rental stores flourish, and TV networks buy the rights to broadcast the movies. Given the time and planning it takes to record, duplicate broadcasts, it seems unlikely to me that the secondary rental market will be significantly curtailed or that the value of TV broadcast movies! will be significantly diminished if citizens are allowed to record broadcasts for their use.

Finally, it is important to remember that the purpose of the FCC is to serve the best long-term interest of the public, not the broadcasters, not the movie industry. While such industries may need protection and regulation, the reason for so doing is to benefit the public by maintaining their viability. As such, it is very important not to excessively overweight the needs of content producers vs the needs of the public to use content in ways which best meet individual needs.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of ler@lerctr.org  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 10:48 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/29/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Lawrence E. Rosenman  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> ler@lerctr.org  
<ADDRESS1> 1905 Steamboat Springs Drive  
<CITY> Garland  
<STATE> TX  
<ZIP> 75044-6749  
<PHONE> 972-414-9812  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> I am \*FIRMLY\* against the idea of a "broadcast flag" on digital television programming. This reduces the copyright "fair use" doctrine to not being applicable to these broadcasts, as well as making the large quantity of LEGITIMATE HOME USE of these broadcasts unavailable. (I.E. Time-Shifting).

The FCC is a PUBLIC agency, and as such works for the PUBLIC, not the Hollywood/MPAA/RIAA.

Please reject this idea NOW and make a firm policy stance that the legitimate public has the right to use the material using OUR AIRWAVES in legitimate ways not necessarily foreseen by the industry.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of mech@well.com  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 10:48 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/29/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Stanton McCandlish  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> mech@well.com  
<ADDRESS1> 2609 Judah St. #8  
<CITY> San Francisco  
<STATE> CA  
<ZIP> 94122  
<PHONE> 415-566-2035  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> Stop being lapdogs for the MPAA/RIAA! You are here to serve THE AMERICAN PUBLIC, not an oligopoly of dinosaur companies who think that only they have any rights in the digital age. The Broadcast Flag proposal is outright unamerican. Do the right thing, and tell the entertainment industry NO for a change!

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of kim@cs.williams.edu  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 10:48 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/29/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Kim Bruce  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> kim@cs.williams.edu  
<ADDRESS1> 140 Cole Avenue  
<CITY> Williamstown  
<STATE> MA  
<ZIP> 01267  
<PHONE> (413) 458-5341  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> Mandating a broadcast flag is taking away my rights to time-shift television content so that I can watch it at a different time. This is a huge grab of my rights that should not be allowed by a simple FCC rule. Please make sure that this does not pass.



## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of floyd@tigerdesign.com  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 10:48 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 10/29/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Floyd Vest  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> floyd@tigerdesign.com  
<ADDRESS1> 2180 Canary Drive  
<CITY> Auburn  
<STATE> AL  
<ZIP> 36830  
<PHONE> 334-826-6699

<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*

<TEXT> I write in opposition to the "Broadcast Flag" proposal. I have confidence that the FCC will see this as another in series of actions by the entertainment industry to restrict the growth of technology out of fear and shortsightedness.

This industry has opposed color television, personal cassette recorders, VCR's and any other technology that benefits consumers and threatens the industry's absolute control over what and when consumers enjoy music and video.

I urge you to reject this proposal and seek less restrictive methods of allow the entertainment industry to protect their intellectual property.